

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/836,455

Applicant(s)

Chatterjee et al

Examiner

Julie E. Burke (Reeves), Ph.D.

Group Art Unit

1642



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Julie E. Burke (Reeves), Ph.D.

(3) _____

(2) Catherine Polizzi

(4) _____

Date of Interview 28 Sep 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 59-61

Identification of prior art discussed:

none

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner explained that newly filed claims 59-61 had not been entered because they were marked as "new" but the claim numbers had already been used by the new claims 59-61 which were entered by Amdt B. Newly filed claims 62-71 were entered as requested by Amdt C. Amdt C's 59 appears to be identical to Amdt B's claim 59. Amdt C's 60-61 do not track amdt B's 60-61. Changes had been made without brackets or underlining. Had the error been of an obvious nature, the claims would have been renumbered under Rule 1.126. In this case, the error was not of an obvious nature. It was not clear which version of claims 60-61 were intended to be examined and whether the claims were merely misnumbered or whether they were meant to be amended.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☒ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Julie Burke

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

JULIE BURKE
PRIMARY EXAMINER